

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been amended.

112 Rejection

In paragraph 3, the Office Action asserts that Claims 1-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action states, "As to independent Claims 1, 10 and 16, there is no support in the specification for the negative limitation 'so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system' ". Applicant has amended Claims 1, 10 and 16 to delete "so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system."

At the top of page 5, the Office Action goes on to state, "the specification is silent as to where the displayed dot is projected from." Applicant respectfully disagrees. The instant application serial no. 10/032,364 states on lines 15-17, "In one embodiment, as the projection display device projects a display, for example web page 550 of Figure 5A, there is a displayed dot within the projected display." Therefore the displayed dot is within the projected display and the projected display comes from the projection display device, therefore, the dot also comes from the projection display.

The Office Action states in the first paragraph on page 4, "a visual representation of said function cannot align with the dot...Thus, it is art recognized that the tilting and rotating of said display projection system cannot result in the alignment of a dot with a visual representation of said function." Applicant respectfully disagrees. Anyone of ordinary skill in the art could implement logic to cause the dot to remain relatively stable while allowing the rest of the projected image to move. For example, assume that the projection display device projects a display, which includes an image and a displayed dot, onto a wall. Assume for the sake of illustration that the projection display device is initially held at a 45 degree angle to the wall. The angle of the projection display device relative to the wall is changed to approximately 60 degrees. The image displayed on the wall gets larger as the projection display device is moved away from the wall due to moving from 45 degrees to 60 degrees. However, software in the projection display device compensates for the movement and causes the dot to remain relatively stable.

Anyone of ordinary skill in the art could figure out this implementation or a similar implementation for "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function."

Applicant respectfully points out that U.S. patent no. 6,201,554 by Lands (referred to hereinafter as "Lands") that even though Claims 1, 10 and 16 no longer recite "so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system," Lands still does not teach or suggest the embodiments recited by independent Claims 1, 10 and 16 because Lands does not teach or suggest "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function." Further, Lands cannot be combined with U.S. patent publication no. 2003/0038928 by Alden (referred to hereinafter as "Alden") to teach or suggest the embodiments recited by the independent Claims 1, 10 and 16 because neither Alden nor Lands teach or suggest "wherein a function of said projected display to be performed is selectable by tilting and rotating said display projection system resulting in a change in an angle of said projected display to align a dot with a visual representation of said function." Therefore, even though the independent Claims 1, 10 and 16 have been amended to remove "so that sensors are not required to detect movement of said display projection system" Claims 1, 10 and 16 are still patentable over Alden and Lands, alone or in combination.

Claims 2-9 depend on Claim 1. Claims 11-15 depend on Claim 10. Claims 17-27 depend on Claim 16. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the respective independent Claims. Further, these dependent claims recite additional limitations which further make them patentable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are patentable for at least the reasons that the respective independent Claims are patentable.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 1-27. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 4/23/, 2007



John P. Wagner Jr.
Registration No. 35,398

Address: Westridge Business Park
123 Westridge Drive
Watsonville, California 95076 USA

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 234-3749 Direct/Cell
(408) 763-2895 Facsimile